25: Schwimmer E-5 (1966-1970) 1974 OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

But for most everyday purposes, the cooperative alliance is even smaller and does not extend beyond the three-generation family.

Relations with uterines, affines, and more distant agnates (that is, those beyond the lineage, and those who are resident in other villages) follow the pattern of competitive exchange. An example of what this implies would be the role of mother's brother as officiator at initiations. Elsewhere, (Schwimmer, 1970b) I show that ideologically, he is the proper person for the office, but that the father's brother and even the father would do as well. The mother's brother is not obliged to act; he is paid if he acts; furthermore he will act only if prior to an initiation, the neophyte involved has obliged his uncle by rendering him small services and being pleasant to him. Certainly the mo/bro si/so relationship is a warm affectionate one, but it is explicitly free from unconditional obligation. It is, in fact, the first formal relationship into which a person enters, where prestations on both sides are by free choice.

How can we explain that, at least in Sasembata, the Orokaiva classify guest friends with the sibling group (by applying the terms *apa/eambo* to them), whereas the Tangu use an affinal idiom? The answer is that siblingship has different connotations in the two tribes. Burridge (1969) emphasizes, above all, the amity that must govern the relationship between senior and junior siblings among the Tangu. If the junior sibling becomes unduly competitive, it is not held against him, but the relationship is redefined so that he becomes a *mwerkindang* – a competitor instead of a subordinate and protégé. The Orokaiva do not permit such a change in status; the younger brother must obey or sever his relations with his family. Moreover, the *apa/eambo* relationship is not confined to the cooperative alliance but includes distant agnates and all uterines within the exogamous group. A good deal of competition and exchange normally occurs between such kin, although the ideology of the *apa/eambo* relationship is basically that of a corporate group pooling resources for the support and protection of its members.

Secondly, the custom of classifying guest friends with siblings is not general among Orokaiva; the Sangara use the term *namei*. Furthermore, terminology is as much an ideological device as a reflection of reality. Use of *apa/eambo* means that people should behave *as if* they were siblings; that is, make free gifts instead of exchange gifts. These terms may be used when one seeks to extract a presentation from a comparative stranger, in which case they mean little more than an appeal *ad misericordiam*. In an hereditary friendship in which it is unusual to make claims, the terms signify that the gifts made to a visiting friend are not repayable but free. Certainly, it would be considered wrong to press claims on the basis of such gifts. On the other hand, the host is expected (*not* merely permitted) to make a return visit, and if he does not present gifts on that occasion, he will certainly be the subject of gossip and loss of reputation.

In considering the manner in which these gifts are given, Sahlins'

26: Schwimmer E-5 (1966-1970) 1974
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

proceeds as though he wished to prove at all costs the absolute interdependence of husband and wife, the absolute necessity of their symbiosis. So important is this ideological notion of symbiosis that the culture has set up numerous imaginary plant symbioses to emphasize it. There is no time here to analyze several other recorded myths which carry the same message.

We may also say that hierarchy is absent on the level of network structure (in the sense of Sperber, 1968) as there is no problem of allocation and no competitive aspect in obligations relating to the giving of coconut and areca. With the exception of mortuary feasts, the nuts are given away in small quantities, as tokens which are part of ordinary social exchange. If a visitor is given no coconut on his arrival in a village, this is rarely because of any absence of coconuts, but mostly because one does not want the visitor to stay, and this unwillingness has nothing to do with the coconut transaction. If there are really no coconuts, this does not affect the relationship. The same applies to areca.

The manner in which coconut and areca are given to guests confirms and expresses the existing social stratification. The most important guest receives the first coconut. He is also likely to receive a large gift of areca, which he then distributes to his followers. Though Orokaiva society is much less stratified than many other New Guinea societies that have been reported, men differ in influence and only the most influential can hold feasts. The position of the "bigger men," as one may call them, is not validated by any ideology or formally designated position, hereditary or otherwise, as is the case in Polynesia.

2. TARO

The foregoing discussion of coconut and areca has been presented because it provides a particularly clear illustration of the nature of code structures and network structures. I would not, however, classify either the code or the networks arising out of coconut and areca exchanges as hierarchical. If we compare these fruits with taro, the principal staple of the Orokaiva,